

I. REMARKS

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Feldman, U.S. Patent No. 6,284,180 (“‘180 Patent”) in view of Sloniewsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,662,863 (“‘863 Patent”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The ‘180 Patent goes through numerous steps that are not required in the present invention. For example, the instant invention does not require cooling water to be utilized. This extra step results in extra time and cost to the method. The present invention is advantageous over the ‘180 Patent because it does not require this step. Further, the indexing wheels have wheel bars 13 which cover the entire bottom surface of the inner surface of the belt 7 except for the lug. Further, the indexing wheel may have removable shelves 16. Again, these features are not part of the present invention and add to expense in time during the fabrication process.

The ‘863 Patent addresses a product design and/or process for making power drive belts with certain properties of the face reinforcing fabric and tooth stock. However, it does not address volume errors inherent in the process. These are an issue in molding is done in a cavity of fixed volume as described in the ‘863 Patent.

As argued in previous amendments, because the ‘863 Patent requires a pre-forming step to form the teeth in the belt slab, it teaches away from the present invention. Applicant respectfully states that there is no teaching or suggestion the ‘863 Patent to have planar molds to form a power drive belt without having a pre-forming step to form the teeth. Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes neither the ‘180 Patent nor the ‘863 Patent teach or suggest the present invention. Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 2 and 6 are allowable.

The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11, 13 and 14-16 were rejected under the '180 Patent, the '863 Patent and further in view of Stecklein, U.S. Patent No. 4,359,355 ('355 Patent). Applicant states that since the same references are utilized to form the rejection for these additional independent claims and dependent claims, the arguments made herein are applicable. As such, Applicant respectfully contends that claims 3-5, 7-9, 11, and 13-16 are also in condition for allowance.

II. CONCLUSION

In response to the Office Action dated July 27, 2007, reconsideration of the previously presented claims is respectfully requested. It is believed the previous amendments and arguments contained herein place claims in conformance with the requirements of the Office Action. At this point, Applicant believes that the claims remaining in the case distinguish over the art cited and comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. As such, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROUSE MCDOWELL

November 27, 2007

Date

Telephone No.: (330) 535-5711

Fax No.: (330) 253-8601

/Heather M. Barnes/

Heather M. Barnes, Esq.

Reg. No. 44,022

Customer #26781

698655.1